Remarks/Arguments

In the Final Office Action dated December 17, 2010, it is noted that claims 1, 5-9 and 12-16 are pending in this application; that objection has been raised with respect to certain informalities alleged to be present in claims 1 and 9; and that claims 1, 5-9 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In this response, claims 1 and 9 have been amended so that all references to the "access point" are consistent within each of the claims. Moreover, a minor editorial change is made to claim 9 to correct an inadvertent grammatical error. Claim 16 has been amended to be consistent with amended claim 9. No new matter has been added by these amendments to the claims.

Objection to Claims 1 and 9

Claims 1 and 9 are objected to because of certain informalities relating to the recitation or reference of the term "access point." Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to consistently call for a "common wireless network access point" when referring to the access point defined therein.

In this regard, claim 16 has also been amended to be consistent with its base claim 9. In view of the claim amendments, withdrawal of the objection and entry of these amendments are respectfully requested.

Cited Art

The following references have been cited and applied in the present Office Action: U.S. Patent 7,515,569 to Prasad (hereinafter, "*Prasad*"); U.S. Patent 6,792,474 to Hopprich et al. (hereinafter, "*Hopprich*"); U.S. Patent 7,177,637 to Liu et al. (hereinafter, "*Liu*"); and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0157090 to Anton, Jr. (hereinafter, "*Anton*").

Rejection of Claims 1, 5-9, and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5-6, 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Prasad in view of Hopprich. Claims 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Prasad in view of Hopprich and Liu. Claims 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Prasad in view of Hopprich and Anton. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims of different claim types, method and apparatus, respectively. The limitations of these claims, which are the subject of the remarks below, are

substantially similar. For this reason and in order to maintain brevity in these remarks, the

remarks below are intended to pertain equally to the similar limitations in independent claims 1

and 9 without further repetition or modification.

None of the references teach, show, or suggest the following features in claims 1 and 9:

*"determining at the common wireless network access point whether the access
request was received from local user or guest, said determining including
examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine
whether such user domain designates a guest domain"*

*"authenticating the request for access received at the common wireless network
access point depending on whether the request was received from the guest or
local user, wherein the authenticating step further comprises the step of
communicating a request for authentication to one or more authentication
servers, the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the
party seeking access is a local user or a guest"* and

*"if such authentication is successful, then routing traffic from the local user
differently from the guest,"*

The USPTO's assertion that Prasad teaches *"determining at the common wireless network

access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest"* is incorrect.

Since Hopprich has not been applied by the USPTO to this feature of claims 1 and 9, the remarks

below can be made with respect to the combination of Prasad and Hopprich, while mentioning

the teachings of Prasad alone.

Prasad does not perform such determining at the access point or at the server. Prasad

stores user profiles at the server or in a database accessible by the server (Prasad: col. 3, lines 59-

64). When a user, not already in possession of its associated profile, supplies the requisite

authentication request to the server via a password and user name, the profile is supplied to the

access point and then, via the access point, to the user (Prasad: col. 4, lines 33-38, 44-49 and 57-

60; FIGS. 3 and 7). According to Prasad (col. 4, lines 10-14 and 33), the profile is already

assigned to the user. There is no teaching or suggestion in Prasad that any entity, whether an

access point or a server, actually determines whether the requesting user is a guest or a local user.

Such a determination is not discussed anywhere in Prasad.

Contrary to the assertions in the present Office Action (p.3 re: claim 1 and p.5 re:

claim 9), the description by Prasad at col. 5, lines 16-20 lacks any teaching or suggestion that a

determination is made whether the requesting party is a local user or a guest. In the cited section, Prasad merely decrypts the supplied profile at the access point and is then able to see the extent of access to be given to the user logged in through the station. This does not remotely suggest that the access point has determined in any way that the logged in user is a guest or a local user. All that the access point appears to know is the "*extent of access to be given to a user logged in through the particular station 402*" and "*the other access points in the network to which the user is allowed access*" (see Prasad, col. 5, lines 18-22). Knowing the "extent of access" for a user or knowing "the other access points ... to which the user is allowed access" cannot reasonably be interpreted as being equivalent to, or suggestive of, the claimed limitation of "*determining at the common wireless network access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest.*"

Thus, Prasad fails to teach, show or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 9. Since Hopprich and the other cited references are not applied to this limitation in claims 1 and 9, the combination of Prasad and Hopprich also fails to teach, show or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 9. For this reason alone, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Prasad and Hopprich do not teach or suggest "*routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest.*" Hopprich is not applied by the USPTO is support of the rejection of this claimed limitation.

Prasad does not route traffic for a guest differently from the traffic for a local user. Instead, Prasad teaches (at col. 5, lines 18-22) that the access point, through which the user gains access, "*knows the extent of access to be given to a user*" and "*knows the other access points in the network to which the user is allowed access.*" Prasad's "extent of access" for a user is <u>not</u> the same as the claimed limitation of "routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest". Access to an entity, such as an allowed access point for a user, can be identical for a guest or a local user in Prasad and nothing therein suggests that the <u>routing of the traffic</u> will be different for a guest or for a local user. There is no mention in Prasad of the terms "route", "routing" or other synonymous terms. Thus, Prasad fails to teach, show, or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 9.

The USPTO relied on Prasad's col. 3, lines 49-56 for the rejection of this claimed limitation (Office Action: p.3, p.5 and p.6, third paragraph). The entire paragraph from Prasad, which includes this cited and applied section, is reproduced below:

> *"The methodologies of the invention, as will be described herein, preferably allow a valid user or users to access one or more access points, and thereby access files (depending on the user and organization) in the server 220. Moreover, the methodologies of the invention preferably provide a network administrator full access to the access points, including the authorization to load new firmware, while providing certain users (e.g., guest users, test users, etc.) selective access (e.g., controlled roaming, limited access to services/servers) to the access points. The techniques of the present invention may be used with any existing security schemes for WLANs or other wireless systems."*

While access is clearly stated in this passage and differences in the extent of access for different network entities are also stated, there is no teaching or suggestion in Prasad that traffic is routed differently for one type of user over another type of user.

Hopprich and the other cited references have not been applied to this limitation in claims 1 and 9. Therefore, the combination of Prasad and Hopprich fail to teach, show or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 9. For this reason alone, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Finally, the limitations of authentication *"depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user"* and *"the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest"* are not taught, shown, or suggested by either Prasad or Hopprich. The teachings of Hopprich are not applied to these limitations in the claims.

Prasad appears to authenticate users in the same manner, whether the user is a guest, or a normal user, or an administrator, or the like. According to Prasad (e.g., col. 2, lines 45-47 and col. 4, lines 46-49), FIG. 3 depicts a login methodology for obtaining profile information corresponding to a given station/user. However, there is no distinction about the particular user type attempting login. This login procedure is applicable to all types of users, according to Prasad. So, if the method of FIG. 3 is analogized to the claimed step of "authenticating," it is clear that this particular method of Prasad fails to show any differences for logging in a user based on the particular user type, such as guest or local user. This procedure for FIG. 3 is repeated at the top part of FIG. 7A and it is clearly shown to be Prasad's authentication procedure.

Nonetheless, whether viewed in relation to the teachings for FIG. 3 or for FIG. 7A, there is nothing in Prasad that teaches, shows or suggests the limitation of authentication *"depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user"* and *"the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest,"* as provided in the independent claims.

In FIG. 4 and in the second portion of FIG. 7A, an association/re-association procedure is shown by Prasad. If this procedure is analogized to the "authenticating" limitation in claim 1, then one can fairly conclude that Prasad again fails to show any differences for associating or re-associating a user based on the particular user type, such as guest or local user. The re-association process of Prasad does not appear to discriminate between user types. All users, regardless of user type, are associated and re-associated with the access point in exactly the same manner by Prasad. Hence, Prasad does not teach, show or suggest the limitation of authentication *"depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user"* and *"the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest,"* as provided in the independent claims.

In light of these remarks, it is submitted that the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9 and the claims dependent thereon would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art upon a reading of Prasad and Hopprich, whether taken separately or in combination. Thus, claims 1, 5-6, 9 and 12 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Prasad and Hopprich.

Since neither Liu nor Anton cures the defects in the teachings of Prasad and Hopprich as identified above with respect to the independent claims, the combination of Prasad, Liu, Hopprich and Anton also would not have rendered obvious claims 1 and 9 and the claims dependent thereon. Thus, claims 1, 5-9 and 12-16 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, please contact the Applicants' attorney to arrange a for a telephonic interview to resolve such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,
Junbiao Zhang et al.

March 17, 2011   /Wan Yee Cheung/
                                                       Wan Yee Cheung
                                                       Attorney for Applicants
                                                       Reg. No. 42,410
                                                       Phone: 609-734-6834

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08540